Pacific School of
Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/comparativestudy00unse

THESES

1934

Volume III

Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
LIBRARY
1962

C O N T E N T S

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

A Comparative Study of the Doctrine of Love in Chinese and Christian Philosophy

Tsing-Yuan Ni

The Place of Vocational Guidance in Religious Education in China

Hsien-Ju Shih

Recovering the "Lost Radiance" of Early Christianity

Fred Sheridan Stripp, Jr.

A Proposed Program of Christian Education for the Chinese Churches in the San Francisco Bay Region

Tso Tin Taam

Curriculum for Japanese Methodist Episcopal Churches on the Pacific Coast

Nobuko Yanagimachi

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE DOCTRINE OF LOVE IN CHINESE AND CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY

by

Tsing-Yuan Ni

B. A. THE UNIVERSITY OF NANKING

1927

THESIS

Submitted in the

Department of philosophy of

Religion and Christian Theology in

partial fulfilment of the requirements for the

degree of Master of Arts in the Pacific School of Religion

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE DOCTRINE OF LOVE IN CHINESE AND CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY.

--- Table of Contents ---

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Ideal of Love

2. The Realization of the Ideal

i. The purpose of the realization

ii. The plan of the realization

3. The Dilemma of Our Time

4. The Twofold Basis of Civilization

II. THE ORIGIN OF LOVE

1. The Chinese Theories

i. A general survey of the Chinese thinkers in Confucius

ii. The philosophical position of Lao-tse

iii. The conception of Tao vs the doctrine of love

2. The Taoist Theory of the Origin of Love

3. The Confucian Theory of the Origin of Love

i. Confucius's conception of 'Jen'(仁)

ii. Mencius's conception of 'Jen'

4. The Motsean Theory of the Origin of Love

5. The Christian Theory of the Origin of Love

6. A Comparison

IV. THE ANALYSIS OF LOVE

A. Love and Other Virtues

1. The Confucian Analysis of Love

2. The Christian Analysis of Love

3. The Three Christian Graces and the Three Confucian Virtues

4. The Upward Movement of Love vs the Downward Movement of Love

B. The Attainment of Love

C. A Comparison

V. THE FUNCTION OF LOVE

1. According to Christianity

i. In Order to Gain Eternal Life

ii. In Order to Observe the 'New Commandment'

iii. In Order to Know God

2. The Chinese Doctrines

3. Love and its Consequences

4. The Steps of Love

5. Love and the Development of Personality

VI. LOVE AS THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PRINCIPLE

1. The Ideal State of Motse

2. The Christian Meaning of 'Brotherly Love'

III. THE MEANING OF LOVE

1. Three Christian Theological Distinctions

i. The Amor Concupiscentiae

ii. The Amor Complacentiae

iii. The Amor Benevolentiae

2. The General Christian Doctrine

i. The Love of God

a. The Old Testament Doctrine

b. The New Testament Doctrine

ii. The Love of Man

3. The Motsean Doctrine

i. Universal Love vs Self-love

4. Comparison of the Christian Doctrine and the Teaching of Motse

5. The Confucian Doctrine

i. The Doctrine of 'Shu'(恕)

6. Contrast Between Confucian and Motsean Doctrine

7. Comparison Between Christian and Chinese Conception of the Meaning of Love

i. Love of God vs Love of Man

ii. A Religious Purpose vs a Political Purpose

iii. The Future Life vs the Present Life

3. The 'Family of God'

VII. CONCLUSION

1. Love as the Highest Human Experience

2. Love as Both Personal and Impersonal

3. Love as Harmony of Religious and Social Ideal

4. Love and the Family Life

5. Love and the 'Family of God'

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE DOCTRINE OF LOVE IN CHINESE AND CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY.

I. INTRODUCTION

"For my generation," writes Mr. H. G. Wells in his OPEN CONSPIRACY, "the role of John the Baptist must be our extreme ambition. . . . We have witnessed the apocalypse of the Great War; we have been misled, we have stumbled through depths of despair, we have learnt. . . Here and there chance may correct and supplement the efforts of our race and save us from the full penalties of our mistakes and negligences, but saving the impact of some unimagined disaster from outer space, the ultimate decision of the fate of life upon this planet lies now in the will of man," --- and above all else in the will of man to realise the highest ideal of love.

If that ideal were ever realised, progress might have a new opportunity. In any prospect of this kind the goal may seem Utopian. Men would be called upon to think as they have never thought before. The undertaking could not fail to be a protracted labour. Because of the prejudices, traditions, misconceptions, apathies, and actual delusions of life which exist to-day, it would be a task not of one but

of many generations. Sooner or later some generation will take up this work. Why not our own? Steam and electricity have brought the peoples of the East and the West together. This, then, is the best time to start the enterprise. Perhaps it is already begun. There are some insistant demands for action. We need a better understanding of ourselves. We need a proper conception of human relations. We need a firm conviction. We need a guiding principle to lead us in our practical application.

By human relationships, we mean what A. F. Riggs says in his INTELLIGENT LIVING, "We do not mean simple physical relations in time and space, but rather a social relationship which is impossible to inanimate objects and at least improbable, except in its most elementary form, among the lower animals. The part of human relationship which interests us most, . . . is not, however, just social in the narrow sense of the word, for it does not depend upon customs, position, or classification in society as a political, economical, or social organization; it does not deal with legal rights, . . . but with certain religious and ethical values of our individual, purposive relation to others. Our fundamental happiness depends more . . . upon winning the love of our friends and upon deserving the approval of our community than upon

amassing a fortune or defeating an enemy. But each human being is part not only of his own little group but also of the larger society called civilization, and is likewise responsible for its progress."

History has shown us that man, as soon as his intelligence grew, began to get the benefit of the accumulated experience of the past generations, through written language. Not only did destructive competition within the group begin to give way to cooperative trade, but the individual's own safety, as well as that of the group, became more sure, less a matter of continual thought and preparation; so that, within the group, as mere survival was sufficiently assured, the demand for a new and less material relationship naturally was born. The helpless, the cripples, the old and worn out, the economically worthless, were no longer exterminated or left to starve. A sense of individual responsibility toward others developed, probably the expression of a strong instinctive force released by the absence of the necessity for self-protection, which grew as part of the progress of society toward civilization. The desire to protect, this responsibility for the welfare of the other fellow, no doubt spread from its earlier application to the members of the individual's group exclusively, until it in-

cluded also those of other groups and finally, as an ethical idea, became all-embracing. The very soul of civilization, hardly appreciable at the dawn, and now, though far from realization, more recognizable, is this purposive relation one to the other of the human beings of which society is composed. The paramount question now for any man is not: What are you doing, nor When, nor Where, but Why?

Another proof that the ethical attitude is an inevitable biological result of the evolution of the race is the well-known fact that man is a planning animal. Now, clearly, a plan must have a purpose whether that be survival, material profit, pleasure, or the welfare of somebody else: This faculty of planning is an inherent, not an acquired, characteristic, but its objective has changed as man has developed. As his power of understanding has increased it has of necessity chosen more and more useful and appropriate purposes, e.g. the welfare of his group, his family, and his kind. To realize the objective of survival or of profit is a relatively easy task requiring little intelligence. To realize the purpose of enabling another's welfare to survive and of adding to civilization in such terms is by far the harder task, for it takes much

more intelligence and has more and greater obstacles to overcome, expecially those presented by the individual's own instinctive counter demands.

It is in clearly defining this purpose and planning for its realization as well as in carrying out the plan when once made, that so many of us fall by the wayside. We fail because we do not think, because we do not recognize this or that relationship as a specific and purposive problem of our own, because we do not realize that the universe is of such a nature that at one time we are facing this dilemma: either men survive or they perish; either they fight against each other or they love each other. We miss the heart of this challenge to live and feel it merely in terms of the pain or pleasure it engenders. On the other hand, to define this purpose, to see it clearly and to adopt it as the goal of our efforts, is the first step toward successful adaptation to our world. Not only did man's intelligence enable him to survive in greater numbers, but his instinctive nature endowed him also with a desire to live with and among his fellows, a desire which seems always to have been, and obviously still is, of an inherently emotional character. Is it not this emotional impulse insistently seeking expression in each individual that was and is chiefly re-

sponsible for men drawing together?

At all events, it seems a reasonable hypothesis that, given this new problem, man's intelligence rose to the occasion and created some primitive plan of group life, the size and kind of group being very likely determined, at least to a large extent, by the necessities of the physical environment. By accepting some such beginning in group life it would seem that the multiplication of the human species must have gone on, in certain sections of the earth, with marked repidity and that, consequently, the size and type of group which his increasing numbers demanded must have developed from the simple to the complex, from animal life to savagery, through barbarism and on up to civilization. Thus man's intelligence had to develop greater functional power as the very condition it had created, namely, his social environment, made greater demands upon it. Man, therefore, is not only the intelligent animal but is also the social animal with higher ideals. His social qualities and the society he has created are as much spiritual as biological products. It is nonsense to think of nature apart from man, to think of the spiritual apart from the biological, to think of the individual apart from the group, to think of a nation apart from the world; To do so is as

absurd as to conceive of man as apart from nature, of the biological without the spiritual, of the group without inaividuals, of the world without nations. The highest ideal is the union of the two, making one whole. This is the most wonderful discovery of mankind.

II. THE ORIGIN OF LOVE

The first question that suggests itself with reference to love concerns its origin. In Plato's SYMPOSIUM, the guests think they need throw no further light on the matter if they can but discover the parents of the god of love whom they are discussing. Indeed, to find the origin of a thing is to begin to have explained it. And so we must first endeavour to see if love can or can not be reduced to a single cause as its origin and what this cause may be: whether it expresses a reality other than itself. In seeking whence love proceeds, we need to compare the different conceptions in the Chinese and Christian philosophy.

I. The Chinese Theories

The Chinese civilization began as early as three thousand years before the Christian era. The so-called

"Three Emperors" (三皇) and the "Five Kings" (五帝) began to govern well-settled communities along the Yellow River (黃河). The "Shu Ching" (書經) or the Book of Historical Document, one of the oldest books extant in China, contains among others some important edicts issued by the last two of the "Five Kings" Yao (堯) and Shun (舜), whose imperial reigns flourished presumably in the twenty-fourth century before Christ. Those documents furnish us with some religious material, shedding light on the early Chinese conception of Heaven (天) or Nature, which, with only slight modifications, is still prevalent at the present day; and also the famous "sixteen-word-doctrine of the Mean" in philosophy, which is that 'the mind of Tao is delicate (or humble), while the mind of man is dangerous (or self-assertive); the proper way to manage them is to hold the mean carefully and constantly.' (道心惟微,人心惟危,允執厥中,惟精惟一). This is the most ancient contrast between human nature and Nature that man has discovered. Confucius developed this into a doctrine of the Mean later. These sixteen words are still frequently quoted by Chinese at the present day. But the most enlightened period in the history of Chinese philosophy is recognized to be in the time when the Chou (周) dynasty

(1122 B.C. - 247 B.C.) first began to show symptoms of decline. The later part of the Chou dynasty was divided into a period called Ch'wen Ch'iu (春秋) 722 B.C. - 481 B.C., and a period called Chuan Kuo (戰國) 481 B. C. - 247 B.C. The complete collection of the writings of these periods is called 'The Books of the Hundred Teachers' (百子全書). During these two periods, Lao-tse (老子), Confutse or Confucius (孔子), Motse (墨子) Chwang-tse (莊子), Yang-tse (楊朱), Mentse or Mencius (孟子), Lih-tse (列子), Kuan-tse (管子), Yinwen-tse (尹文子), Hsun-tse (荀子), Hanfei-tse (韓非子), Shen-tse (愼子) and some others, were the leading figures. Between that time and the present day, there have been hundreds and thousands of so-called philosophers or scholars, many of whom were Buddhist scholars. It is impossible, therefore, for one to begin to make a fair study of them in the limited space of this paper. The best we can do is to choose two or three schools as representing part of the large whole. Therefore, we select here the Taoist School, the Confucian School and the Motsean School.

A. The Taoist School

Most Chinese thinkers agree that man and nature are not mere accidents or chance events, that their existence cannot be haphazard, for there is a Tao, which is the

regulator of human conduct and the guide of natural events. There was no dissenting voice among the members of the Taoist School, the Confucian School and the Motsean School so far as the existence of a Tao was concerned. What did engage them in vehement discussion and controversy was the being or nature of the Tao and its relation to man. The issue was whether it was metaphysical or simply ethical, or rather both metaphysical and ethical. The Taoists thought it was the first, the Confucians thought it was the second, while the Motseans thought it was the last one. The Taoists tried to get man to go back to Tao; the Confucians tried to get man to develop Tao; the Motseans tried to compromise by asking man to follow Tao first, then to develop it.

The Taoists with their remote and profound conception of Tao, a transcendental and pan-theistic conception of Nature, began to disesteem and distrust any doctrine of love. They were not egoistic nor selfish (not even Yang-tse who teaches not to love others at expense to one's own self: There is greater truth underneath than there appears to be), but they thought that to encourage people to love one another, though it is much better than the opposite, is to lead people to stop at a place which is too far from Tao. The nature of Tao is rather that of all-

inclusive or impersonal love. To emphasize this or that particular way of love is to destroy the wholeness and the sacredness of Tao. To teach people to love this or that is to cut Tao into pieces. To cultivate a feeling of love towards a man is to cultivate a disposition to hate too. Because the more you desire to love this or that, the more you will hate the absence or the opposite of this or that. The more man is taught to love the good, the more he is taught to hate the evil. The more he is taught to love his neighbour the more he is taught to hate his enemy. The result of this cultivation will be an unexpected obstacle to the sage. Because when man is taught thus, and thus is developed in him a sense of love and a sense of hatred, it is very easy to misapply them, and thus to create all manner of unnecessary troubles. Tao is the most truly fundamental principle, while love and righteousness are rather secondary. Therefore, Lao-tse says, "When the great Tao ceased to be observed, love and righteousness came into vogue." (大道廢,仁義興).

In Taoistic philosophy, therefore, there is not much said about the doctrine of love, except in connection with the doctrine of Tao. But there is one point to which attention should be called. That is that although Taoists do not discuss positively the doctrine of love, yet, we can

draw a general conclusion as to the Taoistic answer to the problem of the origin of love. Love is considered as one of the attributes of Tao. For in Tao love is a very natural act. Man who are living in Tao are not conscious of their love when they love one another. They practice love so naturally that they even become unconscious of it. But as soon as man becomes conscious of his act as qualified by love or even to emphasize it, then he has lost Tao. In a word, Tao is the origin of love, though it is more perfect than love. It is the whole of the parts. So Tao includes love, but love does not include Tao.

B. The Confucian School.

The Confucian term for love is 'Jen' (仁) which means fellow-feeling for one's kind. Once Confucius was asked, What does 'Jen' mean? His answer was, "To love one's fellow-men." He further says, "Where there is 'Jen' there is man," signifying that the general conception of 'Jen' and of man are mutually involved. When we say that they are mutually involved we do not mean that they are identical. For "Where there is 'Jen' there is man" does not mean "where there is man there is 'Jen'," because, according to Confucius, not every man at any time possess 'Jen', but only when he recognizes his real self as distinct

from others. This recognition is 'Jen'. Therefore is the Chinese character 'jen' formed from the combination of the characters of two (二) and man (人). Cheng Hsuan says in the commentaries of the Book of Rites (禮記), "Jen is the expression of fellowship among men." Without the association of one man with another the conception 'man' cannot be formed. In other words, if there were only one man living on earth, that which we call personality would have no way of exhibiting itself. The manifestation of personality is dependent upon the existence of a common purpose between two or more persons. That being so, the perfection of personality is dependent upon the relationship between two or more persons. Therefore Confucius says, "When one who is 'jen' desires to establish himself, he must establish others; wishing to elevate himself, he must elevate others. To understand another's desires by influence from one's own desires is the way to 'Jen'." The real meaning of 'establishing others', and 'elevating others' comprehends not individuals but the whole of mankind. Since the whole of mankind consists of others and self, to elevate others is to elevate the whole of mankind; and to elevate the whole of mankind is to elevate oneself. To try to understand this principle by inferring the wants of others from

our own desires is the way to 'Jen'. To be lacking in 'Jen' is to be like a benumbed hand or foot which is insensitive to pains in other bodily members. So the wholeness of personality which comes from the association of two or more persons lacks 'Jen' when sensitiveness is keen. In short, the lack of 'Jen' is insensitiveness to fellow-feeling; the fulfilment of 'Jen' is the state of keen sensitiveness.

Mencius, the great successor of Confucius, goes one step further. To Mencius, 'Jen' becomes one of the essential elements that constitute man. So he says, "Jen is what constitutes man. The harmony of Jen and Man is Tao." So love for Mencius becomes the very nature of man. Thus, he further says, "All men have a mind which cannot bear to see the sufferings of others. . . When I say that all men have a mind which cannot bear to see the sufferings of others, my meaning may be illustrated thus: - even now-a-days, if men suddenly see a child about to fall into a well, they will without exception experience a feeling of alarm and distress. They will feel so, not as a ground on which they may gain the favour of the child's parents, nor as a ground on which they may seek the praise of their neighbours and friends, nor from a dislike to the

reputation of having been unmoved by such a thing. From this case we may perceive that the feeling of commiseration is essential to man. . . The feeling of commiseration is the principle of Jen."

And Hsun-tse, another great Confucian teacher, defines Tao as "the fullest development of Jen. It is not the way of heaven nor the way of earth, but that by which a man lives." It is obvious that the Confucian conception of Jen is personal and ethical through and through. It is also human and social through and through. Thus Confucius starts his teaching with man and society, or the social group, i.e. the family group. Humanity is the cause of 'Jen' or love - to love a man because he is a man. I ought to love my fellow-man because I am a man. Man is sufficient to be the cause of love. So for Confucius, man does not need to seek for some other cause of love than himself.

Love is not only personal and social, but also subjective. Thus Confucius says, "Is Jen far off? When I want Jen, there is Jen." So no one can excuse himself for the absence of love. He can love any one he wishes. He can love any one at any time if he desires. He can love any one any where if he cares to. If he does not do

it, it is because he does not want to.

Although the Confucian conception of 'Jen' is subjective, yet at the same time, it is objective too. Thus Confucius also says, "Jen is there, when one is educated but still earnestly pursuing. Jen is there when one is earnest in inquiry and yet is closely thinking." Again, he says, "Of Jen, let no man be moderate in its pursuit, even to surpassing his teacher." According to Confucian teaching, a pupil must be very moderate in every form of learning or doing, in the presence of his teacher, except in the case of Jen. Thus Jen is viewed as being as real as any other object of learning. It is something outside of our selves, to be achieved, and to be achieved by us. In order to attain Jen Confucius teaches us we must pay a very high price if necessary - even to the giving of our life for it. Thus he says, "The man of Jen will not beg for life at the cost of Jen, but will risk or sacrifice his life for the sake of Jen." The death of Jesus Christ on the Cross is an outstanding instance of this. Confucius further says, "Jen means more to man than either water or fire. I have seen men die from treading on water and fire, but I have never seen a man die from treading on the course of Jen." Mencius tried to adopt a compromise

idea between Tao and the idea of man held by Motse by saying that Jen is a part of human nature. "Jen is man himself." And "Fellow-feeling" which is another name for Jen, "is the highest heavenly honour ever given to men."

C. The Motsean School

The one and only ideal of the Motsean School is impartial love for all. Mencius, when criticising the extreme teaching of Motse, says, "Motse loves all men without discrimination. If by grinding his whole body from the crown to the heel he could have benefited the world, he would have done it." This statement, although it comes out of the mouth of his critics, embodies the spirit of the whole of the philosophy of the Motsean School. In Motse's teaching, 'universal love' is equal to the Confucian conception of 'Jen'. This enlarged meaning of the word Jen was adopted by a later Confucian scholar in the Tang dynasty, Han Yu, who was the one who first defined Jen in Motsean language as "Love for all". For Motse, Jen is an acquired virtue not inborn in nature. And only very few have acquired this Jen. The source of Jen, for Motse, is Heaven and thereby acquire Jen too. It is necessary in order to understand Motse to quote one passage of his teaching before we go on.

The disciples of Motse write, "Motse said, 'To accomplish anything what soever one must have standards. None has yet accomplished anything without them. The gentlemen fulfilling their duties as generals and councilors have their standards. Even the artisans, performing their tasks, also have their standards. The artisans make square objects according to the square, circular objects according to the compasses. . . Now, the governors of the empire and of the large states do not observe their standards. . . . What, then, should be taken as the proper standard in government? How will it do to take for the standard, for everybody to imitate his parents? There are numerous parents in the world but few are magnanimous. (The Chinese character for magnanimous is Jen, and for unmagnanimous not-Jen.) Imitating the unmagnanimous can not be said to be following the proper standard. How will it do as a standard for everybody to follow the teacher? There are numerous teachers in the world but few are magnanimous. For everybody to imitate his teacher is to imitate the unmagnanimous. Imitating the unmagnanimous cannot be taken as following the proper standard. . . . So then neither the parents nor the teacher nor the ruler should be accepted as the standard in government. What then whould be taken as the standard in government?

There is nothing better than following Heaven. Heaven is all-inclusive and impartial in its activities, abundant and unceasing in its blessing, and lasting and untiring in its guidance. And so, when the sage-kings had accepted Heaven as their standard, they measured every action and enterprise by Heaven. What Heaven desired they would carry out, what Heaven abominated they refrained from. Now, what is it that Heaven desires, and what that it abominates? Certainly Heaven desires to have men benefit and love one another and abominates to have them hate and harm one another. How do we know that Heaven desires to have men love and benefit one another, and abominates to have them hate and harm one another? Because it loves and benefits men universally. How do we know that it loves and benefits men universally? Because it claims all and accepts offerings from all. All states in the world, large or small, are cities of Heaven, and all people, young or old, honourable or humble, are its subjects; for they all graze oxen and sheep, feed dogs and pigs, and prepare clean wine and cake to sacrifice to Heaven. Does this not mean that Heaven claims all and accepts all? Since Heaven does claim all and accepts offerings from all, what then can make us say that it does not desire men to love and benefit one another?

Hence those who love and benefit others Heaven will bless. Those who hate and harm others Heaven will curse, for it is said that he who murders the innocent will be visited by misfortune. How else can we explain the fact that men, murdering each other, will be cursed by Heaven? Thus we are certain that Heaven desires to have men love and benefit one another and abominates to have them hate and harm one another. The ancient sage-kings, Yu (禹), T'ang (湯), Wen (文) and Wu (武) loved the people universally, leading them to reverence Heaven and worship the spirits. Many were their benefits to the people. And, therefore Heaven blessed them, establishing them kings; and all the feudal lords of the empire showed them respect. (On the other hand) the wicked kings, Chieh (桀), Chow (紂), Yiu (幽) and Li (厲), hated all the people seducing the people to curse Heaven and ridicule the spirits. Great were their injuries to the people. Thereupon Heaven brought them calamity, depriving them of their empire and their lives; and posterity condemned them to this day. . . Thus we have those who abtained blessings because they loved and benefitted the people as well as those who were visited by calamities because they hated and harmed the people."

Motse also distinguishes universal love from

self-love. The former is the cause of order and prosperity of the society, while the latter is the cause of disorder and depression. Universal love is the nature of Heaven, and self-love is the nature of man. But the individual is subject to influence, as silk changes its colour in dying. It is Heaven which wishes and which teaches man to love his fellow-men impartially. When Motse says, "Because it (Heaven loves and benefits men universally," we may well remember what Jesus said in Matthew 5:45, "That you may be sons of your Father in Heaven; He makes His sun rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust." How nearly these sayings resemble each other, and commend each other. It is clear that Jen or the universal love springs from Heaven rather than man. But man can secure it by imitation of the way of Heaven and develop it by his experience, both individual and social. So the source of Jen is rather both Heaven and man. Yet the final source is Heaven.

2. The Christian Doctrine

Love to God and love to man are primary principles of Christianity. They are not independent or coordinate, but are so related that the second springs out from, or, at least, is conditioned by the first. Love to man, in

the biblical sense, springs from a heart renewed, and possessed with the love of God. (I John 4:21) "He who loves God is to love his brother as well." On the other hand, it is vain for us to profess to love God if we do not love our brother. (I John 4:20) "If any one says, 'I love God,' and yet hates his brother, he is a liar; for he who will not love his brother whom he has seen cannot possibly love the God whom he has never seen." But this love to God, which is the spring of love to man, has its source in the knowledge we have of the love which God has to us. (I John 4:7, 19) "Beloved, let us love one another, for love belongs to God, and everyone who loves is born of God and knows God," and "We love because he loved us first."

It is clear, then, that the originative cause of love, for Christian doctrine, is God. "He who does not love, does not know God, for God is love." In this sense, Christian teaching is similar to the Motsean School. Both attribute to God or Heaven the origin of love. When Motse says, "Certainly Heaven desires to have men benefit and love one another and abominates to have them hate and harm one another," he is very sure that the will of Heaven is love and not hate. His statement is just another way of saying, "Let us love one another, for love belongs to God."

The only difference between the two, is that one has a conception of a personal God, a Father-God, while the other has only a conception of a supreme God or Heaven, who transmits His idea only by His own action, because Heaven loves and benefits men universally. But in Christianity we have Jesus acting as a revealer. "God no one has ever seen", but when we see Jesus we see God, as he says, "I and my Father are one." (John 10:30). Now to return to our problm of the origin of love, we find the same answer in both Chinese and Christian philosophy.

The second part of the Christian doctrine - that love to God springs from the love of man - resembles the Confucian doctrine to a considerable extent. Both recognize that without man love can never be expressed fully - in other words, that only man is love fully realized. Man is the center of love, because the visible man is the representative of the invisible God. For Confucius, though he did not touch the problem of God in the Christian sense, yet he intimated that there is something understood or taken for granted. Therefore he did not need to trace the original cause of love beyond man. nd in fact it was not necessary for him to do so in his time. But when it came to Motse, he saw the need to trace a rational ground or meta-

physical support for his teaching. He found it to be Heaven, from which man receives his authority, as it is his duty to do.

From the above comparison, we can say without dogmatizing that Christian doctrine explains the origin of love in much the same manner as the Motsean School and the Confucian School. Love in both Chinese and Christian philosophy is viewed as personal rather than impersonal. It is subjectively willed as well as objectively real. It is social rather than egoistic self-love. To love one's fellow-men is to achieve love for God, or Heaven, and even for oneself. The love of God, or the act of following Heaven, or the achievement of selfhood, can not be accomplished without the love of man, but can be accomplished through the love of man. The three doctrines are mutually supplementary on this point.

III. THE MEANING OF LOVE.

1. Three Christian Theological Distinctions.

There are three philosophies of love, which we will consider before coming to our positive study of the Christian interpretation of love. It is conceived of as amor concupiscentiae or the love of concupiscence, amor compla-

centiae or the love of complacency, and amor benevolentia or the love of benevolence. (Dorner: System of Christian Doctrine, i. # 24-27, 31b, 32, and also Dorner: System of Christian Ethics, pp. 69-74)

A. The Amor Concupiscentiae.

The amor concupiscentiae seeks to supply a deficiency corresponding to which there is a desire for the good that is lacking, and by supplying it seeks to gain the agreeable feeling of completeness. But if another person is employed only as a means of enriching or supplementing one's self, this is possibly only a mode of seeking one's own - a sort of selfishness; and the same would be the case if the person having the desire wished to be not a receiver, but even a giver, provided he only gave in order to rid himself of an oppressive superfluity. For then also the other person would be only a means, whereas the end would be for the giver himself only. Plato in his Symposium has invented a beautiful myth concerning Eros: he makes him the child of Plenty (πόρος) and of Poverty (πενία). But if, on the one hand, πόρος or giving, on the other, πενία or receiving, were only selfish, then from the double selfishness, however contrasted in its manifestation, there would not as yet issue love. Where a relation of love is to be brought about, an abundance

on the one side, a deficiency or an unsatisfied sucepti-bility on the other, may be necessary as prerequisites. But the prerequisite is not the thing itself; love is something which exists for its own sake, and only uses the prerequisites according to its own nature. What then, is the love itself, which must have a place both in him to whom the wealth, and in him to whom the want, belong? It is, at any rate, something else than mere care for one's own interest, whether for a lower or for a higher interest. So long as it is a matter only of one's own interest, we remain confined to the natural realm, in which self-love, the being centred in one's self, holds sway, and makes self its end, and into which something other than one's own self is treated as the end and aim, and of which the first relates to the intelligence, the second to the will.

B. The Amor Complacentiae

The love of complacency, whether aesthetic or intellectual complacency, gives itself up to an object in recognition of its worth. It can pass over into the concupiscential love which would possess the object, or also into amor benevolentiae; but as such, the amor complacentiae reposes in mere contemplation of its object, and simply appreciates the intrinsic worth of the object, without letting the will, in the form of desire, participate. Of this sort is intellectual love as it appears in many forms of mysticism,

and as treated by Spinoza, where the losing of one's self in contemplation and in self-surrender to God is put as the highest love. As applied to God, that style of thought would belong here which accounts for the origin of the world thus: God, absorbed in the image of the world as it stood before His mind, lost Himself in it and imparted His essence to it in a sort of falling away from Himself, or that which is described as superabounding love. But such loss of self in self-surrender could not be called real love. If the world which originated in such loss of self should also on its side have love resembling God's, then it again must lose itself in God, and so on both sides love would consist only in self-annihilation, or in an absorption of the loving one by the loved object; and this would involve the end, or self-destruction, of love. But that would just as little be love as the absorption of the object by the subject deserves the name of love.

C. The Amor Benevolentiae

It is better, therefore, to describe amor as benevolentiae. For well-wishing expresses the inclination of the one person to make the other an end, in order to cultivate with him an active operative relation of love, especially in impartation. This is not merely a contemplative giving of

one's self to the other, but a practical making of one's self a means for the other - a voluntary relation. This explains why it has become almost customary to regard the essence of love as impartation, or self-impartation. Against this, it has been urged that love is to be conceived of, not merely as impartation, but likewise also as participation in joy and sorrow; that it is not described till both together are included. Certainly in each there is an essential function of love; in participation, however, not in the sense that participating love, like the amor concupiscentiae, is concerned with getting possession of the good things which belong to the other person, and with sharing with him. Loving participation, on the contrary, is, strictly speaking, a giving, an imparting of one's self to the other person in sympathy, for the sake, as it were, of continuing and enlarging his personality, which is treated as being an ultimate end. Loving participation therefore belongs properly to imparting love, and both are included in the seeking of fellowship, in self-disclosure made for others, and in devotion to them as an end.

The definitions already considered are directly opposed to one another. For, according to the first, love is only a seeking of one's own, a making one's self the centre

and end; and this was its defect. According to the other two, love is conceived of as only devotion to something else, either in an entellectual or a practical way, this something else being the objective good or end, for which the agent is only the means; and this was their defect. This indicates that, in order rightly to understand the nature of love, these two elements must be united, and must be viewed as forming together a solid unity of blended opposites, viz. the choice of self, which we may call self-love, and an opening out to others in participation and impartation. True love is not something merely single; there is in it a union of opposites which it brings into co-operation with each other. It is a thing by itself, a unique essence, ens sui generis, as much so as any other distinct species of existence. But it unites microcosmically in itself what otherwise appears only isolated, or in one-sided preponderance, - existence for one's self and existence for others. In nature, in the case of single material forms or bodies, the ruling impulse is self-concentration, the force of gravitation, reference to self; in the case of other things, as especially light, it is expansion - an existence, as it were, for others.

2. The Christian Biblical Doctrine

On the whole, therefore, love, in Christian thought, is that principle which leads one moral being to desire and delight in another, and reaches its highest form in that personal fellowship in which each lives in the life of the other, and finds his joy in imparting himself to the other, and in receiving back the outflow of that other's affection into himself. The quality and degree of love vary with the relation in which the persons loving and loved stand to each other, the highest examples of human love - those, therefore, which are peculiarly taken as the images of the divine in its tenderest relations (Isaiah 54:5; Hosea 11:1) - being the love of husband to wife, and of parent to child. Love, therefore, in God, is in general that principle which leads him to desire and seek the good of all His moral creatures; to impart benefits to them in every scale and degree of blessing; to establish relations of fellowship with them, that He may bless them more fully; to restore them when they have turned aside from their true end, and lost themselves through sin (Hosae 13:9): highest of all, to admit them to participation in His own holy, blessed life (IJohn 1:3), in which He and they become one, as the Father and Son are one (John 17:21).

A. The Old Testament Doctrine

When, with this general conception of love as an attribute of God, we turn to the Old Testament, we are likely to feel disappointment. Holiness is in the foreground; love seems to be in the background. The term 'love' used of God's love to His people, is not found till the time of the prophets. Hosea is the first who develops the idea (under the images of marriage and sonship, Hosea 3:1, 11:1, 14:4). In Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Jeremiah and some others, it occurs repeatedly (Deuteronomy 4:37, 10:15 etc., Isaiah 48:14, 63:9, Jeremiah 31:3, Zephaniah 3:17). When the Deuteronomist and the prophets speak of the love of God, as Dr. Orr has pointed out in his article on 'Love' in the Dictionary of the Bible, they carry back that love to the beginning of God's dealings with Israel as a nation, and find the proof of it in His acts towards that people, and the covenant He made with them (Hosea 11:1, Isaiah 63:9, Ezekiel 16). The Deuteronomist carries love farther back still, to the time of the patriarchs, for whose sake this kindness was shown to their descendants (Deuteronomy 4:37, cf. Isaiah 51:1). The biblical history has only to be studied in its entirety to see that it is a revelation of the love of God to Israel throughout. The word itself may not be employed, but there is a rich vocabulary of terms

to denote the particular manefestations of love: such as goodness, mercy, loving-kindness, grace, favour, long-suffering, and numerous others. The term 'hate' in Malachi 1:3 is not to be more rigidly interpreted than Christ's own use of the same term, in Luke 14:26. In short, it may be said that it is of the essence of love in God as in man that it does not remain a mer self-enclosed or inoperative principle, but reveals itself in acts for the benefit of the beloved object. The religion of the Old Testament, therefore, is pre-eminently that of a God who reveals His gracious purpose in history, and acts for man's salvation (Psalm 103: 3, 7).

B. The New Testament Doctrine.

The New Testament doctrine of love of God, according to Orr, presupposes that of the Old Testament, and stands in no essential contradiction with it (as Marcion supposed), but perfects and completes it in the full revelation of the character of God in His Son, and in the discovery of His plan of love for man's salvation, - in the gospel. It is certainly a striking fact, as Orr says, that Jesus in no single saying in the synoptic gospels speaks directly of the 'love' of the Father, or uses the corresponding verb <u>love</u>. The impartial beneficence of the Father is indeed urged as an example (Matthew 5:45), and the Father is set before us as rewarding,

hearing prayer, giving good gifts, forgiving trespasses, caring for His children as for the lilies and the birds, revealing Himself to babes, avenging injuries to His little ones, etc. (Matthew, 6:1-4, 6, 8, 25-32, 10:29-31, 11:25, 18:6). But perhaps even these determinations do not carry us essentially beyond the bounds of the Old Testament. Yet there is a new significance in the very name 'Father', the depth and tenderness of which are revealed in the relation of the Father to the 'beloved' Son; and the whole spirit, character, and gracious words and deeds of Jesus are a revelation of the meaning of love in God which is altogether new.

It is in the Gospel of John that we have the assurances that those who are in union with the Son are loved with the same infinite and tender love with which the Son Himself is loved by the Father (John, 14:21, 23, 17:23, 26). In Acts the word 'love' is not used of God's attitude to man.

The highest form of love, alike in God and man, is not a matter of vague impulse, but involves intelligent choice, the grounds of choice lying solely in His own good, wise, and holy will (Ephesians, 2:3). The exponent of this love of God to man is Jesus Christ. The last and all-comprehensive word on this subject is to be found in the First Epistle of John

when the writer on this subject is to be found in the First Epistle of John when the writer sums up the whole significance of the New Testament teaching: "God is Love".

C. Love in Man.

The primary and unalterable duty of man, in both Old Testament and New Testament, is to love God with all his mind, and heart, and soul, and strength (Deuteronomy, 6:5, Mt, 22:37, 38, Mk, 12:29-33). And then he is to love his neighbours as his own self, because this feeling and enlargement of the heart in love to God, and the experience of the love of God, will not remain self-contained. They will spontaneously overflow in love of others. The love of God thus necessarily issues in love to our brother; and so imperative is this connection, that where the latter does not exist, we are warranted in declaring that the former is absent a so (I John, 3:14-17, 4:7-8).

Love to man has thus its spring and principle in love to God, and here a wider and a narrower sphere is to be recognized - the one, the entire human family; the other, the peculiar brotherhood in Christ (Gal. 6:10, I Peter, 2:10). The grounds on which this duty of love is based are entirely different from those of philosophical ethics. As Orr has pointed out in his article on 'Love' in the Hasting's Bible

Dictionary, the Stoical ideal of a brotherhood of reason remained an unrealized dream; and the ethics of Jesus laid the foundations of a true love to man in spiritual relation to God, and the destination to sonship in His Kingdom. The idea of the love of neighbours is not a new one. It has its source first in Leviticus (19:18) from which Jesus quotes the precept, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Even the 'Golden Rule' is also 'the law of the prophets'.

The question was as to the breadth of the signification of the term 'neighbour'. It is true that as far as it was alien to the modes of thought of antiquity, the Hebrews, under the peculiar limitations of their national economy, were unable to give to this pregnant term 'neighbour' a universal application. So it was reserved for Jesus to correct 'particularism' here, and also, in the light of His broad, universal doctrine of God and man, to lift this duty to its proper level of unlimited obligation. Our 'neighbour', He teaches in the parable of the good Samaritan, is every man without distinction of nationality (Luke, 10:29-37); and the obligation of love is extended to embrace even enemies (Matthew, 5:43-48), the pattern in this case being the example of the Father in Heaven.

This principle, then, becomes in Christian morality the single principle in which all duties to our fellow-men are summed up, for it requires, comprehensively, that we do our neighbour no injury (Romans 13:10), but do him the good we can; it requires even that we overlook his wrongs to us, and strive to overcome his evil with our good (Ro. 12:19-21); and it furnishes the only but all-powerful motive, through which this discharge of duty can be accomplished. "He who loves his neighbour as himself will not, e.g. kill him, will not steal from him, will not bear false witness against him, will not covet his possessions" (Romans 13:9). But this love will further change these negative precepts into positive ones, and lead him to seek his neighbour's highest well-being in soul and body. The example of Jesus in His earthly life is the best interpretation to us of the depth and range of this precept, alike in its practical beneficence, its compassion for the lost, its forgiveness of injuries, and its voluntary self-sacrifice, even unto death, for others (Acts 10:38, Romans 15:3, Hebrews 12:2, 3, etc.)

3. The Motsean Doctrine

Love, in Motse's teaching, is the cause of order of the society, and the absence of love is the cause of disorder. Or rather, universal love is the cause of prosperity of the

society, while narrow love or self-love is the cause of disorders. So Motse tries to rationalize this moral conduct, by observing its practical consequences. Universal love, as Motse sees it, is the nature of Heaven, while self-love is the nature of man. But the individual person is subject to influences, as silk changes its colour in dying. It is Heaven which wishes and which teaches man to love his fellowmen impartially. Thus he says, "The purpose of the magnanimous is to be found in procuring benefits for the world and eliminating its calamities. But what are the benefits of the world and what its calamities? . . . Mutual attacks among states, mutual usurpation among houses, mutual injuries among individuals; the lack of grace and loyalty between ruler and ruled, the lack of affection and filial piety between father and son, the lack of harmony between elder and younger brothers - these are the major calamities in the world. But whence do these calamities arise? Out of mutual love? . . . They arise out of want of mutual love. At present feudal lords have learned only to love their own states and not those of others. Therefore they do not scruple about attacking other states. The heads of houses have learned only to love their own houses and not those of others. Therefore they do not scruple about usurping other houses.

And individuals have learned only to love themselves and not others. Therefore they do not scruple about injuring others. When feudal lords do not love one another there will be war on the fields. When heads of houses do not love one another they will usurp one another's power. When individuals do not love one another they will injure one another. . . When no body in the world loves any other, naturally the strong will overpower the weak, the many will oppress the few, the wealthy will mock the poor, the honoured will disdain the humble, the cunning will deceive the simple. Therefore all the calamities, strifes, complaints, and hatred in the world have arisen out of want of mutual love. Therefore the benevolent disapprove of this want of love." Now that there is disapproval, how can we have the condition altered? Motse said it is to be altered by the way of <u>universal love</u> and <u>mutual aid</u>. But what is the way of universal love and mutual aid? "It is to regard the state of others as one's self." "When feudal lords love one another," Motse further says, "there will be no more war; when heads of houses love one another there will be no more mutual usurpation; when individuals love one another there will be no more mutual injury. When rulers love each other they will be gracious and loyal; when father and son love each other they will be affectionate and filial; when elder and younger brothers love each other they will be

harmonious. When all the people in the world love one another, then the strong will not overpower the weak, the many will not oppress the few, the wealthy will not mock the poor, the honoured will not disdain the humble, and the cunning will not deceive the simple. And it is all due to mutual love that calamities, strifes, complaints, and hatred are prevented from arising. Therefore the benevolent exalt it."

The only difference between the Christian doctrine and the teaching of Motse is that one starts from a religious purpose, while the other starts from a political purpose. Yet both start also from a social purpose. Here we hear Motse saying, "Whoever loves others is loved by others; whoever benefits others is benefited by others; whoever hates others is hated by others; whoever injures others is injured by others." And we also hear Jesus saying, "Judge not, that you may not be judged yourselves; for as you judge so you will be judged, and the measure you deal out to others will be dealt out to yourselves. . . Well then, whatever you would like men to do to you, do just the same to them." Again we hear Confucius saying, "Do not to others as you would not wish done to yourself." Love, thus, is directed by high intelligence, and therefore it is rational. It is also led by human experience, and therefore, it is personal. Love,

again, is a social experience, therefore, it is social. Upon these three points, they all agree.

4. The Confucian Doctrine.

We have seen a part of the meaning of the Confucian doctrine of 'Jen'. Now let us see what is the other part? 'Jen' is the mother of all virtues. Thus the Confucians teach us. And there are two sides to virtues, as we are all familiar with them, namely, the passive virtue and the positive virtue. Let us see first the passive side of the Confucian doctrine.

The Passive expression of this 'love' for fellow-beings is called 'Shu' (恕) in Confucian language. When Tse-kung, one of Confucius' disciples, asked Confucius for the one guiding principle for life, Confucius answered him, "It is Shu; do not to others as you would not like to be done by." Etymologically the character for 'Shu' in the Chinese language, denotes 'similar hearts', meaning that one should put oneself in another's place. For only when people are like-minded can they understand each other's problems and purposes. If I give a dog or a horse what I do not want, it is possible that I am giving it exactly its heart's desire. But as I am a man like other men, what gives me pain must likewise give pain to

another. Let me not give to him according to my dislikes: this is the passive expression of fellow-feeling. Therefore Mencius said, "Earnestly to follow the principle of 'Shu' is a close approach to 'Jen'." But this passive 'Shu' merely approaches 'Jen'; the positive 'Jen' goes much further. As mentioned above, Confucius says, "When one who is 'Jen' desires to establish himself, he must establish others; wishing to elevate himself he must elevate others. To understand anothers desires by inference from one's own desires is the way to 'Jen'." And we compare this to what Jesus said in Matthew 7:12, "Whatever you would like men to do to you, do just the same to them." The positive doctrine of 'Jen' of Confucius lays emphasis on extending what one desires; the passive, 'Shu', on withholding what one does not desire. What I like to hold now I must hold together with my fellow-beings. This is true because the progression of human life involves relationships. Unless all men stand together, no man can stand, because one may hinder others and others may hinder him; unless all men strive for attainment, no man can accomplish it.

Like Motse, and many other Chinese philosophers, Confucius seeks to apply his teaching to politics. The famous 'doctrine of reciprocity', the way for world peace which

indicates both what conditions are considered right, and the method by which they are to be brought about, is derived from his doctrine of 'Jen'. Thus Confucius says, "What a man dislikes in his superiors let him not display in the treatment of his inferiors. What he hates in those who are before him let him not exhibit to those who are behind him; what he hates in those who are behind him let him not imitate in those who are before him. What he hates to receive on the right, let him not bestow on the left; what he hates to receive on the left, let him not bestow on the right. This is the principle of reciprocal action." The final ideal of his political philosophy is defined as 'The universal world' (大同世界), 'The family under Heaven' (天下一家), like the Christian ideal of 'The Kingdom of God' or 'The Kingdom of Heaven'. So in this ideal, 'order' is spoken of rather than 'administration'. The view is also stated thus: "The 'world state' should be equally shared." Both 'order' and 'equal sharing' are the outcome of setting things right according to the doctrine of reciprocity. Hsun-tse says, "A sage is one who gauges others by their own kind, gauging men by men, emotion by emotion, class by class." Reciprocity is therefore another way of expressing fellow-feeling. In this connection two more points are worthy of note, as suggested by Liang Chi-ch'ao, a recent Chinese scholar. "Reciprocity," he says, "is based on

strict equality of relationship; no unilateral rights or obligations are admitted. Reciprocity requires that all observe a common standard, collectively and individually."

The gackground of the doctrine is the passive virtue 'Shu', so defi ned by Hsun-tse as "to eradicate malice and to injure nobody". In order that society may exist wholesomely the minimum obligation must be held sacred and inviolable in the relation among men. But the efficacy of reciprocity does not stop short here but asserts itself positively, and in the essence of 'Jen'. Thus Mencius says, "A man possessing 'Jen' extends his consideration for those whom he loves to those he does not love."

The passive doctrine of 'Shu' bears the same meaning as what Jesus teaches about 'forgiveness'. We remember Jesus says, "If you forgive men their trespasses, then your heavenly Father will forgive you." The Chinese character for 'forgiveness' is 'Shu'.

There are three distinct differences between the Christian and Chinese conception of the meaning of love. They are to be discussed as follows:

1. The first point is this: In Christian doc-

trine, both the Old Testament and the New Testament teaching emphasize love to God, and consider it as a source of all love. While in Chinese philosophy, both Confucianism and Motseanism put love of mankind in place of love to God. While Motse considered Heaven as the standard of the universal love, yet he did not emphasize love to Heaven. He only asked people to do what Heaven wishes them to do. Christianity, on the other hand, holds a close relation between man and his heavenly Father. This recognition of an intimate relation of man to God is lacking in Chinese philosophy. But if we apply this 'love to God' to our practical experience, we get the same result. For if we say that we do love God the only proof of it is whether we love our fellow-beings or not. To love God is to love man. So both Confucius and Motse put 'Humanity' in the place of God. The difference is to be found in the result of religious experience. The Christian feels that he is always with God, a personal God, the heavenly Father, who will give him comfort and help, who will give him what he asks, and to aid him when he is weak, to deliver him when he falls. Thus he gains confidence. Thus he gets what he lacks. An impersonal conception of 'Humanity' may be the stimulation of his enthusiasm toward mankind, but he has to fight his way alone. He has to conquer his desires and his passions, inde-

pendently. If he fa1s he has no place to ask for aid. He is alone. He is himself. Sometimes he has no confidence in himself. Sometimes he valls and never will get up again. Therefore, the difference is a matter of religious experience. But the danger lies in the fact that one may strive only for his personal salvation and forget his fellow-men. He may be well satisfied with his relation to 'his God' without any thing to do with his fellow-beings. The Calvinistic movement has been said to be an instance of this.

2. The second point of difference between the two is the solution offered for the political problem. The Chinese philosophy, as represented by Confucius and Motse, takes a nation or a people as a unit; therefore the teaching of 'universal love' or of 'mutual love' is always applicable between nations and peoples. That is the reason why the Chinese civilization has been able to assimilate different nations and different peoples into one large empire or union. The Chinese people includes at least ten different races. And every dynasty, after conflicts between races and nations, in the past, has been able to unite them into one empire. The Christian doctrine of love was applied to individuals, who have only very little influence in the political circle. This may be the reason why the European nations have never been

able to assimilate each other. While the British Empire popularised the Christian teaching among her own people, yet as a nation she introduced opium into China. Once a Chinese officer was sent by the emperor of his time to England to study the condition of that country. This Chinese officer once asked Queen Victoria, "What method do you use to rule your nation?" The Queen in answering showed him a copy of the Holy Bible saying, "It is this which I use to rule my nation." The Chinese officer could never understand, after he had read the Bible, why the queen of England should use different methods to treat other peoples from those she used for her own people, especially when he remembered that Confucius said, "Jen means this: live reverently, dispose carefully, deal with men loyally and honestly. This is indispensable, even if you are dealing with the barbarians." This difference is, however, not a difference between doctrines and principles, but rather a matter of application, and a difference of the social backgrounds of the doctrines.

3. One more point of difference may be again brought to our attention. The motives of the teachings are different. Jesus starts with a religious purpose. He has a higher cause for the spiritual life. He has to conform to a certain estent to the Jewish traditional religious background. He comes to bring his lost sheep back to God. He has the authority which is directly from God. Both Con-

fucius and Motse start with a political and social purpose. They emphasize the present life. Their motive is a utilitarian principle, not a categorical principle. They pay more attention to the rulers and the higher class of society because the well-being of the people is in these rulers' or kings' hands. If they can be taught to practice the doctrine of 'Jen' and 'Shu', many common people will be bettered by their efforts. And the good ruler will always keep people from doing wrong things.

IV. THE ANALYSIS OF LOVE.

1. The Confucian Analysis of Love.

In the Confucian 'Jen' there may be found five different forms of virtue:

i. The first aspect of 'Jen' is charity (惠澤).

ii. The second aspect of 'Jen'is sincerity (篤厚).

iii. The third aspect of 'Jen' is grace (慈愛).

iv. The fourth aspect of 'Jen' is loyalty (忠實).

v. The fifth aspect of 'Jen' is self-mastery (克己).

To Confucius, Jen was the mother of all virtues. It is all virtue. So there is no one single term to express the whole meaning of Jen except Jen. Therefore, at different times Confucius explains Jen differently. When asked by his dis-

ciples, what Jen is, his answer varies each time with each student. This makes if difficult for western scholars to understand him. When Mr. Legge translates the Confucian Analects into English, he uses different words for the character Jen Sometimes he translates 'Jen' as 'perfect virtue', sometimes as 'virtuous', sometimes as 'goodness', sometimes 'benevolence', sometimes 'love'. This variation may be misunderstood by western readers, except those who know the original meaning of the term. In order to clarify the meaning of Jen, we may quote some passages of the Analects:

Confucius's sayings about 'Jen'

1. By Jen is meant love to man.

2. Clever conversation and a seemingly kind face seldom constitute Jen.

3. A man without Jen is void of reverence (or propriety); a man without Jen is void of passion (or music).

4. A youth should love all, and be true to Jen.

5. Live in Jen; he who does not live in Jen can hardly be considered as wise.

6. You cannot live with men without Jen, either in poverty or in riches, for only men can be at ease who have Jen, and only men of wisdom find profit with Jen.

7. Only men of Jen are able to truly like or hate man.

8. If one be centered in Jen, there will be no evil.

9. I have never seen a man who loves Jen hate the man without Jen. There is no one who can be above the man who loves Jen. But if the man of Jen does hate the man without Jen, it is because the former does not want to be influenced by the latter. I have not seen one who sought Jen and failed to find it. If there are any, I myself have not seen them.

10. The man of Jen works hard first, and then reaps.

11. The man of wisdom enjoys the river, the man of Jen enjoys the mountain. The man of wisdom is active, the man of Jen is quiet. The man of wisdom lives a happy life, the man of Jen lives a long life.

12. Is Jen far off? When I want Jen, there is Jen.

13. The man of Jen establishes himself in order to establish men, educates himself in order to educate men.

14. One should be concentrated in Tao, grounded in virtue, dependent upon Jen and relaxed in the arts.

15. As to holiness and Jen, I dare not be said to have them; yet I am not tired of striving for them, and am not tired of teaching them to my fellow-men: that I dare say.

16. The man of wisdom does not vacillate. The man of Jen does not worry. The man of courage does not fear.

17. Jen is self-control and reverence. When self-control and reverence are obtained, the world is moving toward Jen.

18. The content of Jen is as follows: to see nothing irreverent, to hear nothing irreverent, and to do nothing irreverent.

19. Jen means this: Go out as if you were to usher in an honourable guest (reverence). Employ people as if you were in charge of a great ceremony (sacrifice) - (carefulness). Do not give what you do not want yourself. Thus doing in the state as well as in the family, there will be no grievance.

20. The man of Jen speaks with reticence.

21. Jen means this: Live reverently, dispose of affairs carefully, deal with men loyally and honestly. This is indispensable, even if you deal with the barbarians.

22. The courageous, the enduring, the simple and the modest are near to Jen.

23. The man of Jen must have courage; though a man of courage may not have Jen.

24. The superior man might unfortunately have been deprived of Jen, but no mean man has ever possessed Jen.

25. Can there be Jen without work? Can there be

loyalty without the knowledge of its cause?

26. A man of Jen will not beg for life at the cost of Jen, but will risk or lose his life for the accomplishment of Jen.

27. Jen means more to men than water and fire. Yet I have seen men go to water and fire and die there; but I have not seen men who go to Jen and die there.

28. Of Jen, let no man be moderate in its pursuit, even in surpassing his teacher.

29. To be able to practice the following five (principles) in the world will constitute Jen: They are reverence, generosity, sincerity, sagacity, and charitableness. If reverent, there will be no trespassing. If generous, one will live in popularity. If sincere, men will trust him. If sagacious, success will be his. If charitable, he will be able to handle people.

30. Jen is his who is educated but still earnestly pursuing. Jen is present when one is earnest in inquiry and yet is closely thinking.

Beside the forgoing, there are a number more of places where we can find the word Jen occurring in the Analects. But we choose these passages in order to compare them with the description of love in the New Testament. These passages are

scattered here and there in the Analects. One who reads the book will be impressed deeply by the character Jen. And also he will obtain a general conception of the ideal of life by which he may be guided both consciously and unconsciously.

2. The Christian Analysis of Love

Paul in First Corinthians chapter thirteen gives an analysis of love. It is similar to the Confucian idea of Jen.

1. Love is very patient.
2. Love is very kind.
3. Love knows no jealousy.
4. Love makes no parade.
5. Love gives itself no airs.
6. Love is never selfish.
7. Love is never rude.
8. Love is never irritated.
9. Love is never resentful.
10. Love is never glad when others go wrong.
11. Love is gladdened by goodness.
12. Love is always slow to expose.
13. Love is always eager to believe the best.
14. Love is always hopeful.
15. Love is always patient.

16. Love never fails.

17. Love has no dread in it. (I John 4:18)

(These passages are taken from Moffatt's New Translation.)

The likeness between this and the Confucian description is clear. Confucius, as we have said, is strictly a moralist, his teaching is strictly ethical, his purpose is social and political, and his love is, therefore, love of man. The Christian teaching, on the other hand, is solely religious both in its nature and in its purpose. Its love is a love first of God, then of man. There is a distinct difference between a purely ethical teaching and one that is both ethical and religious. Confucius never thinks of Jen in term of faith and hope. But for Paul, the triangle of virtue consists of: faith, hope and love. "Thus 'faith, hope, and love last on, these three,' but the greatest of all is love." But for Confucius the triangle of virtue consists of: wisdom, Jen, and courage. Thus Confucius says, "Wisdom, Jen and Courage, these three, are the virtues universally binding." And else where he again says, "To be fond of learning is near to wisdom. To practice with vigour is near to Jen. To possess the feeling of shame is near to courage." "He who knows these three things, knows how to cultivate his own character." And also (as quoted above), "The man of wisdom does not waver. The man of Jen does not worry. The man of courage does not fear."

Love, when it is accompanied by wisdom and courage, is dependent entirely upon one's own effort. The luck here is obvious. When wisdom cannot foresee the future situation, and one cannot know what will happen, he will be easily exhausted. Then, love can go no further. When one's courage cannot meet the hardness of the situation and he cannot get any help from himself, nor from any other person, he can practice love no more. But, on the other hand, if by faith one can trust some Super-Power, then his energy will never be exhausted. He can still love even if he is going to die. By hope one is always sure of the future. He can continue to practice love even when his wisdom cannot foresee the outcome. Thus, although wisdom is important, it is hard to secure. Confucius suggested three ways, or rather he saw that there are three sources, from which man gets his wisdom. They are as follows: "Some are born with wisdom; some acquire it by study; and some by painful experience." But he was never able to discover that there is another means of access to wisdom. That is by faith and hope. And so it is with courage. Courage is closely related to wisdom. True courage is that of one who knows what is going on, and is certain that he need not fear. Therefore faith and hope are really the best source of wisdom and courage. And these two belong to religious experience, a fact which Confucius failed to dis-

cover. The instruction which Confucius gives us is to use our own effort, to strive in our own energy, to develop ourselves by our own knowledge - to live a rational life. The Christian contribution is to teach us to seek help from God, to develop ourselves by the guidance of a religious light - to live a religious and intuitional life.

The Christian teaching of love is to lood upward for it, and to trace its origin from above. The Confucian Jen did not claim to be of divine origin, yet Confucius lifted it up from earth to heaven, but did not bring it down from heaven to earth. While the Christian love is to be brought down from heaven to earth first, it is then, its task to rise from earth to heaven again. So, in this sense, the Cnristian doctrine is nearer to Motse's teaching than to Confucius's teaching. Yet in Motse's teaching, there is lacking a personal cognition of God, as our heavenly Father, from whom man can get help by faith and hope. While, in his teaching, man is to observe what Heaven has done to the universe, and all we need is to imitate its universal love, man is still dependent only upon himself.

For Confucius to attain Jen, is neither to trace its origin from a divine source, nor to imitate what Heaven has done to us, but rather by learning and by imitating other men.

Thus one of his disciples, Tse-hsia, says, "Be learning extensively, and having a firm and sincere aim; inquiring with earnestness, and reflecting with self-application: - Jen is obtained." And when one of his disciples Tse-kung asked him, "How may I attain Jen?" he answered, "The mechanic, who wishes to do his work well, must first sharpen his tools. When you are living in any state take service with the most worthy among its great officers, and make friends of the most virtuous among its scholars" (or make friends with the scholars of Jen.) Yet not only can we attain Jen but also we can make, or help, others to attain Jen. The rulers and the scholars can influence the people by their own good deeds or virtuous conduct. So Confucius says, "When those who are in high stations perform well all their duties to their relations, the people are aroused to Jen. When old friends are not neglected by them, the people are preserved from meanness." On another occasion, when he was asked by his best disciple, Yen Yuan, about Jen, he said, "To subdue one's self and return to propriety, is Jen. If a man (the ruler) can for one day subdue himself (by self-control) and return to propriety, all under heaven will ascribe honor to Jen." Therefore for Confucius the way to attain Jen is rather to imitate the sage, or other men who have attained it and who are practicing it, than to imitate Heaven.

If we look to the bottom of the meaning of these three different doctrines, we will find no conflict between them. They are mutually complementary to each other. In Christian doctrine, although God is conceived as the source of love, yet we have no direct way of reaching Him. We only see Him through what He has done for us. And moreover we know God through His representatives rather than directly. We know that God is love, but through some allegorical truth. The Old Testament prophets learned the meaning of love from family life, love between husband and wife, and love between parents and children. The New Testament tells us that we know God through His Son. Love is thus both for Chinese and Christian philosophy manifested by human agents.

V. THE FUNCTION OF LOVE

If we ask ourselves, "Why should we love our fellow-beings or neighbours?" the answer will be given differently by these three doctrines.

1. The Christian answer.

In Christian doctrine, there are at least three possible answers that can be found in the New Testament to the question stated above. They are:

i. In order to gain eternal life (Matthew, 19:16-

22, Mark, 10:17-22, Luke, 10:25-28).

ii. In order to observe the 'new commandment' of Jesus Christ (John, 13:34-35).

iii. In order to know God, because God is love (I John, 4:7)

These answers can be generalized into two reasons:- (1) because God or Christ desires it; (2) in order to gain eternal life, or our personal salvation.

2. The Chinese answer.

The Chinese philosophy as represented by Confucius and Motse, gives similar answers. For Motse, as we have seen, we should love our fellow-beings because Heaven desires us to do so. As to the second reason, both Confucius and Motse agree in saying that to love our fellow-beings is to maintain the social order. The seeming difference between the Christian and Chinese philosophies lies in analyzing the answer. But love is never an individual act, it can never be isolated. "To love our fellow-beings" itself is of a social nature. One starts from the individual himself; the consideration of his own benefit then extends to his fellow-beings; while the other starts from the social order as a whole, then goes back to the individual himself. The results are the same. The only difference may be, if there is a dif-

ference, that to put the individual himself first may lead one to think of his own benefit alone, so that he may think he can be independent of society.

But this was not 'Jesus' own ideal. Jesus reminds us to observe the impartiality of God's love, that "he makes his sun rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the just and unjust. For if you love only those who love you (which is a selfish motive),what reward to you get for that?" So, 'to gain eternal life' can not be the aim of love but rather its natural reward. To love our fellow-beings is to follow a higher cause and for the benefit of others, to treat others as ends not as means to our own salvation. So in order to love our fellow-beings, we will be willing to give up every thing that we have, even our own life, without any hesitation. We must not always be conscious of our own salvation. This is why Jesus says, "Whoever tries to secure his life will lose it, and whoever loses it will preserve it." In these words, we have the highest interpretation of love. That is, to love our fellow-beings is to love the social whole, of which my self is only a part; when the whole is to be loved or to be perfected, then my self is naturally included. It is of no use to try to separate myself from the whole; because if I do so, then the result will

be, neither the whole will be benefited nor myself be saved.

Moreover, to say "we love because God is love" may be easily understood as merely the Kantian formula, 'love for love's sake'. But this is not what we mean by 'the highest cause'. We trace our love to God, and conceive God as the source of love, and believe that we love because He desires us to do so. If so, then why should God love men? What is God's purpose in loving men? And why should He desire us to love each other? We can not say that God loves men for the sake of love, nor can we say that God loves men because of His very nature. God loves men in order to benefit them. He loves men that they may develop themselves. He loves them that they may contribute their best to the progress of the whole of mankind, universal civilization. Therefore to say 'love for love's sake' is too vague. But if we say 'to love is to love the universal whole', this is exactly what God has shown us, or what Heaven has done. This universal whole is thus a concrete whole, because it includes my fellow-beings as well as myself. It is something very definite and concrete, and affords us a definite object of love, yet at the same time, this object is not a narrow and selfish one. So, when Jesus teaches us, 'Love thy neighbour as thy self', he does not emphasize our own ego or self, but

bids us to enlarge our self, in order to enclude both our neighbours and ourselves. It is rather to forget our small self or ego. Motse has expressed exactly the same idea as Jesus, when he says, "Partiality is to be replaced by universality. But how is it that partiality can be replaced by universality? Now, when every one regards the states of others as he regards his own, who would attack others' states? Others are regarded as ours. When every one regards the capitals of others as he regards his own, who would seize the others' capitals? Others' are regarded like ours. When every one regards the house of others as he regards his own, who would disturb others' houses? Others are regarded like oneself. Now, when the states and cities do not attack and seize each other and when the clans and individuals do not disturb and harm one another - is this a calamity or a benefit to the world? Of course it is a benefit."

It is only a love of passive or negative nature, not to do harm rather than positively to do something for the good of others. So the second stip is to love our fellow-beings positively. Thus Motse continues, "When we try to develop and procure benefits for the world with universal love as our standard, then attentive ears and keen eyes will respond in service to one another, then limbs will be strength-

ened to work for one another, and those who know the Tao will untiringly instruct others. Thus the old and those who have no wife nor children will have the support for their old age, and the young and weak and orphans will have care and admonition to grow up in. When universal love is adopted as the standard, such are the consequent benefits."

3. Love and its Consequence.

Love is the best human relation, as both God has shown us on the one hand, and man has discovered through his observation and social experience on the other. For there are only three possible ways in which man treats his bellow-beings. They are: (1) Love, (2) Hatred, (3) Indifference. Indifference, however, cannot properly be counted, because an indifferent attitude of a man toward one another means that they have no relation at all. They have nothing to do with each other, for they may not know each other. Suppose there are men living in Mars, at the present time, we, as men of the earth, may be entirely indifferent to them, and vise versa. But when men get together with each other, there cannot be indifference to each other. So their relation would be either of love, or of hatred. Now let us compare love with hatred, to see which is the better way for human society and human civilization. The result of hatred

is harm, and that of love is benefit. If I do others harm, and others, of course in turn, do me harm, that means I would do harm to myself, and others would do the same to themselves also. Therefore, as far as the whole of human welfare is concerned, love is beneficial and hatred is detrimental. As far as civilization is concerned, it is also love that makes progress, and hatred that creates calamities. So we hear Jesus saying, "You have heard the saying, 'you must love your neighbour and hate your enemy,' but I tell you, love your enemies." And so Motse says,"When we come to think about the several benefits in regard to their cause, how have they arisen? Have they arisen out of hate of others and injuring others? Of course we should say no. We should say they have arisen out of love of others and benefiting others."

4. The steps of love.

The difference between Motse's view and that of the Confucians is deeper than appears at first sight. And by comparing them, we may also be able to know where lies the Christian view. Motse contrasts impartiality with partiality; Confucius lays imphasis on fellow-feeling. One's love for oneself should extend to love for others; love for one's own home should extend to love for the homes of others; love for one's own country should extend to love for the countries

of others. There is 'self' and there is 'other' or 'neighbour'; discrimination between 'self' and 'other' or 'neighbour' is a natural phenomenon. But Motse regards such discrimination as the source of evil. So long as there is the notion of 'self' as against 'other' or 'neighbour', a conflict of interests will sacrifice 'other' to 'self'. To speak of love under such circumstances is not thorough-going. "Love only exists when it has reached everybody; love has disappeared the moment it fails to include all; when love is not pervasive it cannot be called love." The characteristic of love is its impartiality and pervasiveness. If discrimination intervenes, there will be those who are loved and those who are not loved. This is the reverse of impartial love, and results in discriminating hatred. "The curse of the world arises from the distinction between 'self' and 'other' or 'neighbour'."

But according to the Confucian school, these discriminations to exist in the facts of actual human life. To be blind to this hypothesis is to ignore the fact that human nature does not readily change. Nevertheless Motse himself maintains that his teachings are practicable. "If the thing is not practicable, even I would reject it. Is it possible that anything good should be impracticable?" So his argument starts from the basis of self-interest. Motse says,

"I wonder what is the mind of a filial son regarding his parents? Does he wish others to love and protect them, or hate and abuse them? Surely he must be anxious that others should love and protect them. What should he do to ensure this? Should he first love and protect the parents of others in order that others may in return love and protect his own parents? The Book of Odes says, 'No abuse will be without retort; no virtue will be without reward. When I receive a peach I shall return a plum.' The significance of this saying is that those who love others will surely be loved, and that those who hate others will surely be hated."

But the Confucians argue this very point thus: Suppose in a famine, when both one's father and another old man were on the verge of starvation, Motse found a bowl of rice sufficient to save the life of only one man. To whom would he give the food, to his own father or to the other man? If he gives to his father, he discriminates; if to the other old man, then he is rightly blamed for neglecting his parent; - which according to Chinese tradition is the most unfilial thing. So the Confucian teaching is in a formula of "extending the love of my parents to those of others" - which will produce no such difficulty. And in Christian teaching we also find, "Love thy neighbour as thy self." Motse's

failure is, as has been said, due to the fact that he sees only the quality of men, and entirely ignores the fact that differences in relationships do exist. And yet, whatever we may think of the practicability of Motse's point of view, we must admit that impartial love is the highest possible of human ideals. But this highest ideal is itself under certain conditions, such that, 'only when love itself is not limited' can it cover the whole, or all of the objects of love.' And only the love of God or Heaven or some representative of the two, can be called universal or impartial love. Therefore, when love is limited in person, time, and space, then the Confucian teaching is right. That means to start from the near and go to far. In Christian doctrine we find in many places the same idea. In Second Peter, we have, "Piety with brotherliness, brotherliness with Christian love, and so on." When love is not limited or when it is large enough to cover the objects of love in a general sense, then Motse is right. That is not to be partial but universal, the same idea that we find in Christian teaching also. "For if you only love those who love you, what reward do you get for that? . . . You must be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect." Thus in Christian philosophy, we again find teachings similar to both Confucianism and Motseanism.

5. Love and the development of personality.

There may be many different interpretations of Christian doctrine concerning the problem of the development of personality. But we may take the passage cited from Second Peter, to indicate one of the representative views, and compare it with what Confucius had in mind. The writer of Second Peter must have had a deep religious experience in his own development of personality, for he writes, "for this very reason, do you contrive to make it your whole concern to furnish your faith with resolution, resolution with intelligence, intelligence with self-control, self-control with steadfastness, steadfastness with piety, piety with brotherliness, brotherliness with Christian love" (Moffatt's translation). If we arrange these in a systematic order, we have: 1. faith, 2. resolution, 3. intelligence, 4. self-control, 5. steadfastness, 6. piety, 7. brotherliness, 8. Christian love. That is to say, the development of personality starts from faith, and is completed in universal love. It is not easy to arrange Confucius' teaching regarding the development of personality, in a similar definite order, because Confucius never himself worked it out. But from his teaching, we can find out the several necessary stages which seem to correspond to the order given by the writer of Second Peter. If the Christian doctrine of the

development of personality starts from faith, Confucius' teaching must be said to have started from learning. And the order will be somewhat as follows: (1. learning, 博學), (2. sincerity, 篤厚), (3. reflection, 近思), (4. good deeds, 善行), (5. piety, 誠敬), (6. self-control, 克己), (7. steadfastness, 堅忍), (8. brotherliness, 博愛), (9. fellow-feeling, 友愛.)

As Confucius was not a religious teacher, and did not attempt to touch upon religious problems, such as the problem of death or immortality, the problem of Deity and Spirits, etc., he could not be expected to have discovered the method of faith. Like Socrates, he discovered the method of knowledge or learning. He presents himself as an example: "At fifteen, I had my mind bent on learning." Many places in his Analects, one finds him mentioning the importance of learning. A person without faith he says, is like a man walking in the darkness without a light; he may reach his destination finally, but it requires more time and risk to do it. So, the man who has faith, walks directly forward, while the man without faith, but with reason or knowledge, will look left and right before he can go straight forward. Confucian piety has a different meaning from Christian piety. The former means 'fear'; the latter means both 'veneration of the Su-

preme Being, and also love of His character." The Confucian 'piety' is applied in three ways: "There are three things of which the superior man stands in awe. He stands in awe of the ordinances of Heaven. He stands in awe of great men. He stands in awe of the words of sages." It is obvious, therefore, that Confucian piety has only the negative veneration of heaven but lacks the positive side of love of God. The Confucian sense of the value of reflection is well stated by Confucius, when he says, "The superior man (or gentleman) has nine things which are subjects with him of thoughtful consciousness. In seeing to see distinctly, in hearing to hear clearly, in expression to be benign, in bearing to be decorous, in speaking to be sincere, in his office to be respectful, in doubt to inquire, in resentment to think circumspectly, in view of promotion to consider righteousness."

The eighth item of the Confucian order of 'brotherliness', in the Chinese language, means 'love of family members and relatives'. For Confucius, all love starts from the love of parents, or 'filial piety'. A child first learns to love his brothers and sisters. Then, his love gradually extends to the relatives of the family. So, this order is considered by the Confucians as a natural order. When one is able to love all his near relatives, he is also able to love

all his fellow-beings. If he fails to do the first part of his duty, accordingly, he will never be successful in loving his fellow-beings. So Mencius says, "Treat with the reverence due to age the elders in your own family, so that the elders in the family of others shall be similarly treated; treat with the kindness due to youth the young in your own family, so that the young in the families of others shall be similarly treated."

In self-control, the Confucians have a standard for directing practical experience. The word used by the writer of the Second Peter, although he did not give a further explanation of it, must bear the same meaning as that of the Confucian teaching. When Confucius was asked by one of his disciples Yuan Wei, about the practice of self-control, Confucius answered, "Look not at what is contrary to propriety; listen not to what is contrary to propriety; speak not what is contrary to propriety; make no movement which is contrary to propriety." This might be a comment on the Christian doctrine.

So, in both doctrines, we find love to be the paramount step in the whole process of the development of personality. It is the completion of a personality. The dif-

ference between the two is only a difference of emphasis upon the starting point. The one emphasizes faith, the other emphasizes knowledge. In other words, the former seeks some help from the Super-Power, while the latter depends only his own effort.

VI. LOVE AS THE RULING PRINCIPLE.

Love, as we have seen, is the best of the human relations that mankind has been able to discover and to preserve. Any ideal family, nation, or other successful social group must possess this relation among its members. History shows that the true prosperity of any social institution is the result of a well ordered and peaceful state. It is in good order because love is the directing principle of the social relations. It is peaceful because love is the directing principle of the social relations. And the members love each other and understand each other and, therefore, help each other. It is in a good order because each of them has the full chance to develop himself, to contribute his part to the group.

So, in Motse's ideal state of social groups, the relation is described as follows: "It is to regard the state of others as one's own, the houses of others as one's own,

the persons of others as one's self. When feudal lords love one another there will be no more war; when heads of houses love one another there will be no more mutual usurpation; when individuals love one another there will be no more mutual injury. When ruler and ruled love each other they will be gracious and loyal; when father and son love each other they will be affectionate and filial; when all the people in the world love one another, then the strong will not overpower the weak, the many will not oppress the few, the wealthy will not mock the poor, the honoured will not disdain the humble, and the cunning will not deceive the simple. And it is all due to mutual love that calamities, strifes, complaints, and hatred are prevented from arising. Therefore the benevolent exalt it."

The Christian doctrine of 'brotherly love' offers a similar ideal state to this. According to Grimm, the word 'brother' in Christian philosophy has four senses in the New Testament.

1. It is 'brother' by natural birth, as in Matthew 4:18, the relation between Peter and Andrew his brother, or that of James and John.

2. It is member of the nation, as in Romans 9:3, the relation between Paul and his country-men.

3. It is fellow-man, as in Matthew 5:22, 24, or it

may be indicating the fellow-citizen in the 'Kingdom of God'.

4. It is fellow-Christian.

The people who call God 'Father', and Jesus 'Lord', call each other 'brother' and 'sister' (James, 2:15, Romans, 16:1) A collective name for the whole body from this point of view is the 'brotherhood' (I Peter, 5:9). In I Peter 2:17 the verb used in this sense, and in most similar cases, is 'love'. But the substitute for it is 'brotherly love'. It is the fundamental and all-inclusive duty of Christians as related to each other.

On the whole, both Christian teaching and that of Motse seem to agree in viewing the social institutions as the objects of the ruling principle, which is called 'love'. When Jesus speaks about the Heavenly Father and the brotherhood of mankind, he really means a family relation. The so-called 'Kingdom of God' was but an enlarged term for a Jewish traditional conception. The best relation between persons is that of family. Every member in a family has a real sense of freedom. The only relation that makes a family is love. So, let us say the 'Family of Heaven' or the 'Family of God' or the 'Universal Family' instead of 'Kingdom' of any kind.

VII. CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, we should say that the purpose of this paper has been rather simple, although its contents may appear various and its sequence complex. It attempts to demonstrate first that love is essentially the highest human experience which can justly be represented in both religious and social categories; secondly, that love is both impersonal (in the sense indicated) and personal, but it can only find its supreme expression for mankind in a person or a group of persons and finally the entire realm of persons; thirdly, that Confucius, Motse, and Jesus, critically studied, reveal to us both the religious and social nature of love, yet in Jesus the harmony of the two is to be found in its fullest realization; fourthly, that the fullest expression of love is to be found in family life; and lastly, that the highest ideal of love of mankind should be in the form of a universal family, so that our object for the modern age should be the 'Family of God', in which both religious and social demands are fulfilled, and in which both the spiritual and physical life are united. Therefore, to realize the 'World Family' should be the final ideal of both our religious faith and social enterprise, so that all human effort should be directed to this end.

E N D.

End of

A comparative study of the doctrine of love in Chinese and Christian philosophy

Bound volume is continued by

The place of vocational guidance in religious education in China

Recovering the "lost radiance" of early Christianity

A proposed program of Christian education for the Chinese churches in the San Francisco Bay region

Curriculum for Japanese Methodist Episcopal churches on the Pacific Coast

Search by above titles on archive.org to continue reading this collection of Pacific School of Religion Theses from 1934, call number Thesis Cage 1934 v.3